

REMARKS

Claims 1-5 are pending in the application. Claims 1 has been amended and claims 6-15 have been added, leaving claims 1-15 for consideration upon entry of the present Amendment. Support for the amendment is found in Figure 1.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Shibata et al. (U.S. 6,147,451) ("Shibata"). "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verleagal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Moreover, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the * * * claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

First, Applicants point out that the rejection is improper because Shibata was not published more than a year before the filing date of the application. Instead, the Shibata reference should have been used as a 35 U.S.C. §102(e) reference.

Claims 1-2 include the following limitation: "a voltage source line is provided for each column; and voltage from a voltage source is provided from one end of said voltage source line." Shibata does not disclose those limitations.

Figure 2 of Shibata shows that both ends of voltage source lines 6 are connected to an X-driver 32. According to claims 1-2, only one end of a voltage source line is connected to a voltage source. Thus, Shibata does not anticipate claims 1-2. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata in view of Channing et al. (U.S. 4,837,566) ("Channing"). Claims 4-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Shibata in view of Channing and further in view of Mihara (U.S. 6,421,034). For an obviousness rejection to be proper, the Examiner must meet the burden of establishing that all elements of the invention are disclosed in the prior art. *In re Fine*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1598 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *In Re Wilson*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 494, 496 (C.C.P.A. 1970).

Claims 3-5 include all of the limitations of claim 1. As explained above, Shibata does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claim 1. Moreover, neither Channing nor Mihara cure the deficiencies of Shibata. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection as to claims 3-5 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Applicants have also added claims 6-15. Shibata does not teach or suggest "a data line is provided for each column; and a data signal is provided from one end of said data line" as claimed in claim 6-10 or "a voltage source line and a data line are provided for each column; and voltage from a voltage source is provided from one end of said voltage source line and a data signal is provided from one end of said data line" as claimed in claim 11-15. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner allow claims 6-15.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: Lisa A. Bongiovi

Lisa A. Bongiovi

Registration No. 48,933

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

55 Griffin Road South

Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone (860) 286-2929

Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Customer No. 23413

April 6, 2004